



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/718,370	11/20/2003	Naveen Chopra	D/99778D	9530

25453 7590 11/17/2005

PATENT DOCUMENTATION CENTER
XEROX CORPORATION
100 CLINTON AVE., SOUTH, XEROX SQUARE, 20TH FLOOR
ROCHESTER, NY 14644

EXAMINER

TRAN, THAO T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1711

DATE MAILED: 11/17/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/718,370

Applicant(s)

CHOPRA ET AL.

Examiner

Thao T. Tran

Art Unit

1711

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 October 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 10/11/2005 has been entered.
2. Claims 1-12 are currently pending in this application. No claim has been amended in this Paper.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Chopra et al. (US Pat. 6,488,870) or Chopra et al. (US Pat. 6,492,025).

The applied reference has a common assignee with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) might be overcome either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in

Art Unit: 1711

the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not the invention "by another," or by an appropriate showing under 37 CFR 1.131.

Chopra '870 teaches a display device or an article of clothing, comprising a plurality of microcapsules adhering to its surface by an adhesive, the microcapsule including a polymerized, optionally hardened shell encapsulating a liquid droplet and a particle component, and a second coating encapsulating the shell (see abstract; Fig. 2; col. 2, ln. 16-20; col. 3, ln. 65 to col. 4, ln. 66; col. 6, ln. 35-45). The particle component is a single particle or from one to five particles, each particle being a bichromal ball having two hemispheric surfaces having different color and electrical characteristics; whereas the shell is insufficient to accommodate another similarly-sized particle that is in addition to the one or five particles (see col. 3, ln. 3-7; col. 5, ln. 33-38; col. 10, ln. 40-42). The particles are hemispheric bichromal balls, wherein one hemisphere is white due to titanium dioxide, and the other hemisphere is black due to magnetite or carbon black (see col. 5, ln. 33-54). The microcapsules have a diameter of about 10 to about 300 mm, and the shell has a thickness of about 0.5 to about 5 mm (see col. 7, ln. 34-39).

Chopra '870 further teaches hardening of the shell being formed by coating the microcapsules with a second coating in an emulsion (see col. 6, ln. 35-45). Thus, the hardened shell would be considered as micelle. Furthermore, since the hardened shell is optional, it's limitation would have no patentable weight. Hardening of the shell can also be induced by introducing a crosslinking agent into the emulsion during gelation for the formation of the shell (see col. 6, ln. 46-59). Thus, the hardened shell is in direct contact with the liquid droplet.

Chopra '025 teaches a display device or an article of clothing, comprising a plurality of microcapsules adhering to its surface by an adhesive, the microcapsule including a polymerized, optionally hardened shell encapsulating a liquid droplet and a particle component, and a second

Art Unit: 1711

coating encapsulating the shell (see abstract; Figs. 2-4; col. 2, ln. 4-8; col. 3, ln. 53 to col. 4, ln. 65; col. 6, ln. 23-33). The particle component is a single particle or from one to five particles, each particle being a bichromal ball having two hemispheric surfaces having different color and electrical characteristics; whereas the shell is insufficient to accommodate another similarly-sized particle that is in addition to the one or five particles (see col. 2, ln. 59-62; col. 5, ln. 21-26; claims 1-2, 7-12, 19). The particles are hemispheric bichromal balls, wherein one hemisphere is white due to titanium dioxide, and the other hemisphere is black due to magnetite or carbon black (see col. 5, ln. 21-33). The microcapsules have a diameter of about 10 to about 300 nm, and the shell has a thickness of about 0.5 to about 5 nm (see col. 7, ln. 22-26).

Chopra '025 further teaches hardening of the shell being formed by coating the microcapsules with a second coating in an emulsion (see col. 6, ln. 23-37). Thus the hardened shell would be considered as micelle. Furthermore, since the hardened shell is optional, it's limitation would have no patentable weight. Hardening of the shell can also be induced by introducing a crosslinking agent into the emulsion during gelation for the formation of the shell (see col. 6, ln. 34-47). Thus, the hardened shell is in direct contact with the liquid droplet.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 10/11/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The examiner reiterates the previous rejection as presented in the Final rejection of 7/06/2005.

In the Remarks, Applicants contend that the references Chopra '870 and Chopra '025 differ from the presently claimed invention in that the references teach a complex coacervate

Art Unit: 1711

shell while the instant invention is directed to a micelle shell. Applicants further explain the morphological difference between these two types of shell, by pointing out the molecules in the micelle shell are arranged in an orderly fashion whereas the molecules in the coacervate shell have no discernable organization. However, the claim language does not include how molecules are arranged in the shell in order to distinguish the presently claimed invention from the prior art. Since the prior art discloses the same chemical components and the same microcapsule, the prior art would read on the instantly claimed invention.

6. Applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references.

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thao T. Tran whose telephone number is 571-272-1080. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, from 9:00 a.m. - 5:30 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Seidleck can be reached on 571-272-1078. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1711

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

tt
November 10, 2005

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Thao Tran". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

THAO T. TRAN
PATENT EXAMINER